

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AHKEEM WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

RASAEI RAMA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-00232-KES-SAB

ORDER SCREENING COMPLAINT AND
GRANTING LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED
COMPLAINT

(ECF No. 1)

THIRTY-DAY DEADLINE

On February 21, 2025, Plaintiff Ahkeem Williams, who is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed a complaint against Rasaei Rama and Kaweah Health Mental Health. (ECF No. 1.) Following administrative filings not relevant here, on March 7, 2025, the Court granted Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and but stated that "service of the complaint shall not be undertaken until the Court screens the complaint in due course and issues its screening order." (ECF No. 7.) The Court now undertakes screening of the complaint.

I.

SCREENING REQUIREMENT

The *in forma pauperis* statute provides that a court shall dismiss a case if, *inter alia*, the complaint is frivolous or malicious, or fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). In determining whether a complaint fails to state a claim, a court uses the same pleading standard used under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). A complaint need only

1 contain “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief . . .”
 2 Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Detailed factual allegations are not required, but “[t]hreadbare recitals of
 3 the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.”
 4 Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009), citing Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S.
 5 544, 555 (2007).

6 To survive screening, a plaintiff’s claims must be facially plausible, which requires
 7 sufficient factual detail to allow the Court to reasonably infer that each named defendant is liable
 8 for the misconduct alleged. Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678-79; Moss v. U.S. Secret Serv., 572 F.3d 962,
 9 969 (9th Cir. 2009). The “sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully” is not
 10 sufficient, and “facts that are ‘merely consistent with’ a defendant’s liability” falls short of
 11 satisfying the plausibility standard. Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678; Moss, 572 F.3d at 969.

12 Moreover, federal courts are under a duty to raise and decide issues of subject matter
 13 jurisdiction *sua sponte* at any time it appears subject matter jurisdiction may be lacking. Fed. R.
 14 Civ. P. 12; Augustine v. United States, 704 F.2d 1074, 1077 (9th Cir. 1983). If the Court
 15 determines that subject matter jurisdiction is lacking, the Court must dismiss the case. Id.; Fed.
 16 R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

17 Leave to amend may be granted to the extent that the deficiencies of the complaint can be
 18 cured by amendment. Cato v. U.S., 70 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1995).

19 II.

20 COMPLAINT ALLEGATIONS

21 The Court accepts Plaintiff’s allegations in his complaint as true for the purpose of this
 22 *sua sponte* screening requirement under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

23 On “May 17, [2024],” Plaintiff traveled by ambulance from Farmersville, California, to
 24 Kaweah Heath Hospital for “physical and mental health.” (ECF No. 1, p. 5.) Plaintiff explained
 25 to Rasael Rama how “my home has been being invaded privacy invasion and I needed to talk he
 26 said that I was outside of reality stuck me with a needle put me to sleep and put me on a 5150
 27 hold cause I reported to him privacy invasion of home and phone.” (Id. at pp. 5-6.) Plaintiff
 28 states that he is entitled to relief because it was a false 5150 hold and that he was “not out of

reality” and that there was “no need for a needle in my arm with medication and a 5150 hold that day.” (*Id.* at p. 6.) Plaintiff states that he reached out to the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Eastern District of California, but no investigation took place. (*Id.*)

On January 15, 2025, at 6:15 a.m., Plaintiff alleges that staff at Kaweah “Heath Mental Health” allowed Plaintiff to be sexually harassed by another patient. (*Id.*) “There was a patient who came [and] grab my left butt[ocks] with this right hand for like 2 seconds. But I warn staff about his sex play and how other staff [subliminal] talk and call me a porn faggot which is similar to the phone and home invasion through Sniffer apps and other that people yell through my phone I’ve reported all my phones to your U.S. Attorney’s Office.” (*Id.*) (emphasis in original). According to Plaintiff, “[i]t seems to follow me everywhere I go.” (*Id.*)

Plaintiff continues, “I believe I am entitled to relief cause staff has been warn of sex play plus I face sexual harassment through privacy invasion from years [and] these people follow me now and yell sexual insults like porn fag, queer fear, savor tooth that a new one monkey mouth, a pervert. And then that happen in [their] facility and they say symbolically under [their] breath there’s no phones in there.” (*Id.* at p. 7) (emphasis in original).

Plaintiff seemingly raises two claims. First, Plaintiff states he was held under a false 5150. Second, Plaintiff states he experienced sexual harassment. In his prayer for relief, Plaintiff seeks punitive damages in the sum of \$500,000 and damages in the sum of \$400,000. (*Id.* at p. 8-9.)¹

III.

DISCUSSION

A. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8

The Court finds that Plaintiff has not identified cognizable causes of action and that his allegations supporting his claims are legally conclusory. In other words, instead of explaining to the Court of what happened relevant to a cause of action, Plaintiff has made unsupported and/or seemingly irrelevant statements. For example, Plaintiff frames his first claim around that he was

¹ Plaintiff concludes with a discussion about another case, which the Court was unable to locate. (ECF No. 1, p. 9.)

1 placed under a false 5150 hold. However, Plaintiff has not included facts that demonstrate that
2 there was in fact a false 5150 hold nor identified a cause of action or legal theory that would
3 allow him to seek relief in federal court because of a false hold. Even giving Plaintiff every
4 reasonable inference, the Court is unable to construe a claim.

5 Plaintiff centers his second claim around sexual harassment. While Plaintiff claims he
6 faced sexual harassment, he has not alleged that either defendant did any offending behavior; in
7 fact, Plaintiff alleges that only other patients harassed him. Significantly, and again, Plaintiff has
8 not identified a cognizable cause of action or legal theory that would allow him to seek relief in
9 the federal courts with these facts. Again, the Court is unable to even construe a claim.

10 To be sure, Plaintiff has listed the Sixth Amendment as a potential basis for his claims.
11 However, the Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim under any potential theory
12 implicating that Amendment. For Plaintiff's benefit, the Court quotes the Sixth Amendment
13 below:

14 In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a
15 speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district
16 wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall
17 have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the
18 nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the
19 witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining
20 witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his
21 defense.

22 U.S. Const. Amend. VI.

23 While Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) requires that Plaintiff need only provide a
24 short and plain statement of the claim, the claims nevertheless need to be facially plausible. The
25 Court finds that such adequate factual allegations are absent in the complaint to support any
26 claim, and therefore, the complaint fails to state a claim for which relief may be provided.

27 IV.

28 CONCLUSION AND ORDER

For the reasons discussed herein, Plaintiff fails to state any cognizable claims for relief
and shall be granted leave to file an amended complaint to cure the deficiencies identified in this
order, if he believes he can do so in good faith. See Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127 (9th

1 Cir. 2000). If Plaintiff chooses to file an amended complaint, that complaint can be brief, Fed.
 2 R. Civ. P. 8(a), but it must state what each named defendant did that led to the deprivation of
 3 Plaintiff's constitutional rights or violations of state law. Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678-79. Importantly,
 4 the "[f]actual allegations must be [sufficient] to raise a right to relief above the speculative
 5 level." Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555 (citations omitted). Additionally, Plaintiff may not change
 6 the nature of this suit by adding new, unrelated claims in his amended complaint.


7 Finally, Plaintiff is informed that the Court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to
 8 make Plaintiff's amended complaint complete. Local Rule 220 requires that an amended
 9 complaint be complete in itself without reference to any prior pleading. This requirement exists
 10 because, as a general rule, an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint. See
 11 Ramirez v. County of San Bernardino, 806 F.3d 1002, 1008 (9th Cir. 2015).

12 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. The Clerk of the Court shall send Plaintiff a complaint for civil case form;
- 14 2. Within **thirty (30) days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall file
 15 an amended complaint curing the deficiencies identified by the Court in this
 16 order;
- 17 3. The amended complaint, including attachments, shall not exceed twenty-five (25)
 18 pages in length; and
- 19 4. If Plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint in compliance with this order, the
 20 Court will recommend to a district judge that this action be dismissed consistent
 21 with the reasons stated in this order.

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: **March 27, 2025**

24 
 25 STANLEY A. BOONE
 26 United States Magistrate Judge
 27
 28